



dredging containment

GAINER Tom

to:

Chip Humphrey, Kristine Koch, Richard Muza, ANDERSON Jim M, MCCLINCY Matt,
Karl Gustavson, KingTW@CDM.com

06/07/2012 04:24 PM

Hide Details

From: GAINER Tom <GAINER.Tom@deq.state.or.us> Sort List...

To: Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Kristine Koch/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,

Richard Muza/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, ANDERSON Jim M

<ANDERSON.Jim@deq.state.or.us>, MCCLINCY Matt

<MCCLINCY.Matt@deq.state.or.us>, Karl Gustavson/DC/USEPA/US@EPA,

"KingTW@CDM.com" <KingTW@CDM.com>,

History: This message has been replied to.

In regards to the LWG dismissing containment measures for all dredging activities....perhaps there are some situations (depending on contaminants, presence of liquid-phase, mobility, river forces at that location, etc.) where containment doesn't provide much benefit, but I can't get the image below out of my mind! The photo is looking down at the rigid containment established at the 2008 near-shore, land-based, petroleum-contaminated sediment removal at the Arco Site, where sheet piles clearly contained several months of constant "chocolate milk" turbidity within the excavation area. Periodic water quality monitoring outside the containment area documented that both turbidity and dissolved phase contaminants were adequately contained. No significant release of contaminants were observed during sheet pile removal.

I'm not advocating sheet pile containment everywhere, but I'm uncomfortable dismissing dredging containment site-wide.



Thanks-

Tom Gainer, P.E.

Project Manager/Environmental Engineer

Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, NW Region

503-229-5326